

1  
2  
3  
4

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

8 ROSEMARY N. CHUKWUDEBE, No. C-13-5466 EMC  
9 Plaintiff,

10 v. **ORDER RE DISMISSAL**  
11 PONGRI LU, *et al.*,  
12 Defendants.

15 Previously, the Court temporarily stayed the case at bar and ordered Plaintiff Rosemary N.  
16 Chukwudebe to show cause as to why this Court should retain subject matter jurisdiction over her  
17 case. *See* Docket No. 19 (Order at 2) (citing 28 U.S.C. § 1367). In her response to the order, Ms.  
18 Chukwudebe argued that there is diversity jurisdiction and submitted a second amended complaint  
19 (“SAC”), which alleges, *inter alia*, that there is such jurisdiction. *See* Docket Nos. 20-21 (SAC and  
20 response to OSC).

21 Ms. Chukwudebe was not permitted to file a SAC, both because of the Court's stay and  
22 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15, which allows only one amendment as a matter of course. *See*  
23 Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a)(1)-(2). However, in the interest of justice, the Court shall consider the contents  
24 of the SAC to determine whether it does in fact have jurisdiction over the case.

25 | //

26 | //

27 | //

28 | //

1       The Court concludes that it does not. Ms. Chukwudebe has not pled a federal cause of action  
2 in her SAC.<sup>1</sup> Thus, there is no federal question jurisdiction. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1332. As to Ms.  
3 Chukwudebe's assertion that there is diversity jurisdiction, that too is not supported by the very  
4 allegations of her complaint. Even if her damages were in excess of \$75,000, diversity jurisdiction  
5 requires complete diversity. "Complete diversity means that each of the plaintiffs must be a citizen  
6 of a different state than each of the defendants." *Howard v. Farmers Ins. Co.*, No. CV 12-01068  
7 DDP (JCx), 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 50154, at \*5 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 9, 2014). Here, Ms. Chukwudebe  
8 admits that she is a citizen of California. *See* Docket No. 21 (Resp. at 2). Even if some of the  
9 named defendants are not citizens of California, others clearly are – *e.g.*, Christopher Pirrone, David  
10 Pirrone, Steve Gohari, Bernard J. Maryanski, Anthony O. Egbase, Onyinye Anyama, Chike  
11 Emenike, Victoria Orafa, and Allan Wilcox, each of whom Ms. Chukwudebe describes in her  
12 complaint as a "California Lawyer." SAC ¶¶ 7-8, 10, 15-16, 24-27.

13       The only issue remaining, therefore, is whether the Court should retain or decline to exercise  
14 supplemental jurisdiction. Because there are no claims over which the Court has original  
15 jurisdiction, the Court deems it appropriate to decline supplemental jurisdiction pursuant to 28  
16 U.S.C. § 1337(c)(2)-(3) (providing that a court may decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction  
17 over a claim if "the claim substantially predominates over the claim or claims over which the district  
18 court has original jurisdiction" or if "the district court has dismissed all claims over which it has  
19 original jurisdiction").

20       The Court therefore dismisses this case in its entirety. Ms. Chukwudebe is advised that this  
21 ruling does not bar her from filing suit in state court to obtain relief. The Court further advises Ms.  
22 Chukwudebe that, should she wish to pursue relief in state court, she should promptly take action or  
23 her state court action may later be time barred. *Cf. id.* § 1337(d) (providing that "[t]he period of  
24 limitations for any claim asserted under subsection (a), and for any other claim in the same action  
25 that is voluntarily dismissed at the same time as or after the dismissal of the claim under subsection

---

26  
27       <sup>1</sup> While the caption of the SAC does refer to "constitutional violations," the body of the  
complaint reflects that Ms. Chukwudebe's substantive claims are for wrongful foreclosure,  
professional malpractice, extrinsic fraud, fraud and conspiracy to defraud, conversion, quiet title,  
declaratory relief, and violation of California Business & Professions Code § 17200.  
28

1 (a), shall be tolled while the claim is pending and for a period of 30 days after it is dismissed unless  
2 State law provides for a longer tolling period").

3 The Clerk of the Court is instructed to enter judgment and close the file in the case in  
4 accordance with this opinion.

5  
6 IT SO ORDERED.  
7

8 Dated: April 23, 2014  
9

  
10 EDWARD M. CHEN  
11 United States District Judge  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28